



LAWRENCE  
LIVERMORE  
NATIONAL  
LABORATORY

# Bounds and Estimates for Elastic Constants of Random Polycrystals of Laminates

J. G. Berryman

August 26, 2004

International Journal of Solids and Structures

## Disclaimer

---

This document was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor the University of California nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or the University of California. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or the University of California, and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsement purposes.

## Bounds and Estimates for Elastic Constants of Random Polycrystals of Laminates

James G. Berryman\*

*University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory,  
P.O. Box 808 L-200, Livermore, CA 94551-9900, USA*

In order to obtain formulas providing estimates for elastic constants of random polycrystals of laminates, some known rigorous bounds of Peselnick, Meister, and Watt are first simplified. Then, some new self-consistent estimates are formulated based on the resulting analytical structure of these bounds. A numerical study is made, assuming first that the internal structure (*i.e.*, the laminated grain structure) is not known, and then that it is known. The purpose of this aspect of the study is to attempt to quantify the differences in the predictions of properties of the same system being modelled when such internal structure of the composite medium and spatial correlation information is and is not available.

PACS numbers: 46.65.+g, 46.25.Cc, 46.25.-y, 44.35.+c, 47.55.Mh, 05.60.Cd

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the history of studies of random heterogeneous media, the earliest work on electrical, elastic, and viscous media [1–6] involved ad hoc procedures intended to provide sensible estimates of the physical constants of interest in such systems. Much later the early work on bounding methods first showed that some of the known estimates were in fact rigorous bounds [7] and subsequently produced quite accurate and useful bounds [8, 9] that were then proven to be optimal in the sense that for certain special classes of microstructures the bounding values could be attained. Later still it was established that certain choices of the ad hoc estimates or effective medium theories had special relationships to the bounds. In particular some of these estimates were shown always to lie between the rigorous upper and lower bounds on the material constants [10–15].

Bounding methods obviously have the great advantage of rigor, but the disadvantage that, for real material constants and each fixed choice of volume fraction, there are two numbers and, for complex material constants, a closed curve in the complex plane describing the bounds [16–18]. But, for practical applications, users often want estimates instead of such bounds — especially in applications to porous media where the bounds may commonly be far apart, and the lower bound often vanishes. Clearly estimates together with additional measures of the probable range of errors in those estimates would be highly desirable for many applications. And surely if bounds are available, then estimates can often be found. Hill (1952) resolved this dilemma famously by averaging (*i.e.*, using either the mean or the geometric mean) the well-known Voigt and Reuss bounds for elastic constants,

thereby producing the very well-known Voigt-Reuss-Hill estimates. In other cases, known estimates have already been shown to lie between the bounds, but in fact if the analytical form of the bounds had been known first, then in many cases these common estimates could have very easily been deduced directly from the bounds [12].

The author has recently shown [19] how the Peselnick and Meister bounds [20] for random polycrystals of laminates can be used to provide both bounds and self-consistent estimates of the shear modulus in the special case of heterogeneous elastic media having constant bulk modulus. The present paper will expand on this idea by showing that in general the algorithmic form of the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds for hexagonal crystals can be simplified into explicit formulas, and

subsequently rewritten so it is straightforward to obtain self-consistent estimates for both bulk and shear modulus for this same type of random polycrystal of laminates. But no restrictions (except the usual physical ones, such as positivity) need to be imposed here on the range of values present for bulk or shear moduli in the composite.

The second section presents the model of random polycrystals of laminates and provides some details of the basic analysis. Then the third section shows how to simplify the Hashin-Shtrikman-type bounds of Peselnick, Meister, and Watts to analytical forms for both bulk and shear moduli. The fourth section shows how to construct self-consistent estimates from these analytical bounds. Examples of the use of the formulas are presented in the fifth section and the conclusions are summarized in the final section. Appendix A summarizes some recent results needed in the main text concerning certain product formulas in hexagonal anisotropic media. Appendix B displays the original version of the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds and also shows two examples of the details of the algorithmic calculations, together with the final results for the self-consistent estimates.

---

\*berryman1@llnl.gov

## II. STRUCTURE OF THE MODEL

### A. ELASTICITY OF LAYERED MATERIALS

We assume that a typical building block of the random system is a small grain of laminate material whose elastic response for such a transversely isotropic (hexagonal) system can be described by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} \\ \sigma_{22} \\ \sigma_{33} \\ \sigma_{23} \\ \sigma_{31} \\ \sigma_{12} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & & & \\ c_{12} & c_{11} & c_{13} & & & \\ c_{13} & c_{13} & c_{33} & & & \\ & & & 2c_{44} & & \\ & & & & 2c_{44} & \\ & & & & & 2c_{66} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e_{11} \\ e_{22} \\ e_{33} \\ e_{23} \\ e_{31} \\ e_{12} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_{ij}$  are the usual stress components for  $i, j = 1 - 3$  in Cartesian coordinates, with 3 (or  $z$ ) being the axis of symmetry (the lamination direction for such a layered material). Displacement  $u_i$  is then related to strain component  $e_{ij}$  by  $e_{ij} = (\partial u_i / \partial x_j + \partial u_j / \partial x_i) / 2$ . This choice of definition introduces some convenient factors of two into the 44, 55, 66 components of the stiffness matrix shown in (1).

Although some of the results presented here are more general, we will assume for definiteness that this stiffness matrix in (1) arises from the lamination of  $N$  isotropic constituents having bulk and shear moduli  $K_n$ ,  $\mu_n$ , in the  $N > 1$  layers present in each building block. It is important that the thicknesses  $d_n$  always be in the same proportion in each of these laminated blocks, so that  $f_n = d_n / \sum_n d_n$ . But it is not important what order the layers were added to the blocks, as Backus's formulas [21] for the constants show. For the overall behavior for the quasistatic (long wavelength) behavior of the system we are studying, Backus's results (also see [22, 23]) state that

$$\begin{aligned} c_{33} &= \left\langle \frac{1}{K+4\mu/3} \right\rangle^{-1}, & c_{13} &= c_{33} \left\langle \frac{K-2\mu/3}{K+4\mu/3} \right\rangle, \\ c_{44} &= \left\langle \frac{1}{\mu} \right\rangle^{-1}, & c_{66} &= \langle \mu \rangle, \\ c_{11} &= \frac{c_{13}^2}{c_{33}} + 4c_{66} - 4 \left\langle \frac{\mu^2}{K+4\mu/3} \right\rangle, & c_{12} &= c_{11} - 2c_{66}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This bracket notation can be correctly viewed: (a) as a volume average, (b) as a line integral along the symmetry axis  $x_3$ , or (c) as a weighted summation  $\langle Q \rangle = \sum_n f_n Q_n$  over any relevant physical quantity  $Q$  taking a constant value  $Q_n$  in the  $n$ -th layer.

### B. RANDOM POLYCRYSTALS OF LAMINATES

For our general modeling problem having arbitrary (but nonnegative) values of the  $\mu$ 's and  $K_n$ 's, suppose we construct a random polycrystal by packing small bits of this laminate material into a large container in a way so that the axis of symmetry appears randomly over all possible orientations and also such that no misfit of surfaces

(and therefore porosity) is left in the resulting composite. (Note: It is known that small amounts of misfit porosity can make a significant difference to the results [24], but we will not study this issue here.) If the ratio of grain size to overall composite is small enough so the usual implicit assumption of scale separation applies to the composite — but not so small that we are violating the continuum hypothesis — then we have an example of the type of material we want to study.

For each individual grain in this polycrystal, Eqs. (2) are valid locally (*i.e.*, for locally defined coordinates), and the grain bulk modulus  $K_R$  is given by (20) for all the grains. The factors  $3K_R$  and  $2G_{\text{eff}}^v$  are not necessarily eigenvalues of elastic stiffness for individual grains. The Voigt average for shear is given in Appendix A by (22), which is an upper bound on the isotropic shear modulus of the random polycrystal [7].

We distinguish between “correlated” and “uncorrelated” bounds. For example, the most familiar bounds — after the uncorrelated Voigt and Reuss bounds (*i.e.*, the volume averaged mean and harmonic mean respectively of the constituents' constants) — are the uncorrelated Hashin-Shtrikman bounds:

$$K_{HS}^{\pm} = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{K_n + 4\mu_{\pm}/3} \right]^{-1} - 4\mu_{\pm}/3 \quad (3)$$

and

$$\mu_{HS}^{\pm} = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{\mu_n + \zeta_{\pm}} \right]^{-1} - \zeta_{\pm}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\zeta_{\pm} = \frac{\mu_{\pm}}{6} \left( \frac{9K_{\pm} + 8\mu_{\pm}}{K_{\pm} + 2\mu_{\pm}} \right), \quad (5)$$

with  $K_+$  and  $K_-$  being the highest and lowest values of  $K_n$  in the system, and similarly  $\mu_+$  ( $\mu_-$ ) being the highest (lowest) value of the shear modulus. Milton [25], by greatly simplifying several earlier presentations, presented examples of correlated bounds where the correlations were introduced explicitly through spatial correlation functions. But here we introduce correlations instead through the grain laminations. The Voigt and Reuss bounds (20)-(23) are then considered correlated because of the assumed internal grain-like structure. Some limited numerical comparisons of these bounds, and a few others, to the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds [20, 26] were given previously by the author [19]. It was found that the best and also most relevant bounds were clearly the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds [20, 26], which are presented again in Appendix B.

### III. ELASTIC CONSTANT BOUNDS FOR THE MODEL

#### A. SIMPLIFIED BOUNDS ON BULK MODULUS

The formulas for the Hashin-Shtrikman-type bounds on polycrystals of grains having hexagonal symmetry are summarized in Appendix B. These bounds were derived by Peselnick and Meister [20] with a correction added later by Watt and Peselnick [26]. The bounds are expressed algorithmically – not as formulas. In order to gain the insight needed to deduce effective medium approximations based on such bounds, it is most helpful to have formulas. So it will be our goal to find corresponding formulas for bulk modulus and, in the next subsection, also for shear modulus.

The main observation that helps us to find such formulas in this case is based on the easily verified fact that

$$1 + 2\beta_{\pm}G_{\pm} = -2\beta_{\pm}\zeta_{\pm} \quad (6)$$

where  $\zeta_{\pm} = \frac{G_{\pm}}{6} \left( \frac{9K_{\pm} + 8G_{\pm}}{K_{\pm} + 2G_{\pm}} \right)$  is defined exactly as in (5), but the meanings of the arguments  $G_{\pm}$  and  $K_{\pm}$  differ. In (6), the values  $G_{\pm}$  and  $K_{\pm}$  are those given in Appendix B, having the significance of the shear and bulk moduli of the isotropic comparison material. In (5), the bulk and shear moduli are the lowest and highest values present among all the values found in the system. In contrast, for the values in (6) and Appendix B, we typically have  $G_- = c_{44}$  and  $G_+ = c_{66}$ , and then the values of  $K_{\pm}$  are computed from (29)–(31). In (5), the values of  $K_{\pm}$  are just the highest and lowest bulk modulus values in the system – thus resulting in the Hashin-Shtrikman-Walpole bounds [27] – and not necessarily very closely correlated with the values of  $\mu_{\pm}$ .

To obtain the desired result for bulk modulus, first rearrange (24) into the form

$$K_{PM}^{\pm} = \frac{K_V + K_{\pm}2\beta_{\pm}(G_{\pm} - G_{\text{eff}}^v)}{1 + 2\beta_{\pm}(G_{\pm} - G_{\text{eff}}^v)}. \quad (7)$$

Then, making use of (29), we have

$$K_{PM}^{\pm} = \frac{K_V[1 + 2\beta_{\pm}(G_{\pm} - G_{\text{eff}}^r)]}{1 + 2\beta_{\pm}(G_{\pm} - G_{\text{eff}}^v)}. \quad (8)$$

And, finally, substituting (6) into (8), we obtain the desired result:

$$K_{PM}^{\pm} = \frac{K_V(G_{\text{eff}}^r + \zeta_{\pm})}{(G_{\text{eff}}^v + \zeta_{\pm})}. \quad (9)$$

This is the main result of this subsection.

Note that  $\zeta_{\pm}$  is a monotonic function of both arguments  $G_{\pm}$  and  $K_{\pm}$ . As  $K_{\pm}$  ranges from 0 to  $\infty$  for fixed  $G_{\pm}$  (which can happen as the model parameters vary),  $\zeta_{\pm}$  lies in the bounded range  $\frac{2}{3}G_{\pm} \leq \zeta_{\pm} \leq \frac{3}{2}G_{\pm}$ . As  $G_{\pm}$  varies from 0 to  $\infty$ ,  $\zeta_{\pm}$  also ranges from 0 to  $\infty$ . In particular, when  $\zeta_- = 0$ , we have

$$K_{PM}^- = K_R, \quad (10)$$

and, when  $\zeta_+ = \infty$ , we have

$$K_{PM}^+ = K_V, \quad (11)$$

which are obviously the lower and upper bounds on  $K$  given by Reuss and Voigt, respectively. Thus, this analytical formula parameterizes the bounds in terms of the  $\zeta_{\pm}$  parameter, which is still determined by the formulas given for  $G_{\pm}$  and  $K_{\pm}$  in Appendix B. But, as we will soon see, the formula (9) has the advantage that it is easy to use as the basis for an effective medium approximation.

An interesting limit that is readily checked is the case of constant shear modulus,  $\mu = \text{const}$ . Then,  $G_{\text{eff}}^v = G_{\text{eff}}^r$ , and from the product formula (see Appendix A and/or [28]),  $K_V = K_R$ . In this special case, the grains are actually isotropic, and the grain bulk modulus  $K^*$  satisfies Hill's equation

$$K^* = \left[ \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{f_n}{K_n + 4\mu/3} \right]^{-1} - 4\mu/3. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore, since  $K_V = K_R$ , this is the correct result also for the overall bulk modulus  $K^* = K_V$  of the system we are modeling. It is easy to check that Backus's formulas give exactly (12) for this limiting case.

#### B. SIMPLIFIED BOUNDS ON SHEAR MODULUS

To find the simplified version of (25) for the overall shear modulus, we first shift  $G_{\pm}$  to the left hand side, then multiply by  $-2\beta_{\pm}$ , and add unity to both sides of the result. We find that

$$[1 + 2\beta_{\pm}(G_{\pm} - \mu_{PM}^{\pm})] = \frac{1}{1 + 2\beta_{\pm}B_2^{\pm}}. \quad (13)$$

Using (6) to simplify the left hand side, we then have

$$\mu_{PM}^{\pm} + \zeta_{\pm} = -\frac{1}{2\beta_{\pm}(1 + 2\beta_{\pm}B_2^{\pm})}. \quad (14)$$

The right hand side of (14) can be greatly simplified. When this (rather tedious algebra) has been accomplished, the formula (14) can be inverted to give

$$\frac{1}{\mu_{PM}^{\pm} + \zeta_{\pm}} = \frac{1}{5} \left[ \frac{1 - \alpha_{\pm}(K_V - K_{\pm})}{G_{\text{eff}}^v + \zeta_{\pm} + \frac{\alpha_{\pm}}{2\beta_{\pm}}(K_V - K_{\pm})} + \frac{2}{c_{44} + \zeta_{\pm}} + \frac{2}{c_{66} + \zeta_{\pm}} \right], \quad (15)$$

which is the desired form of the Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds on overall shear modulus of a polycrystal of grains having hexagonal symmetry. This is the main result of this subsection.

To check one known limit of this formula, consider the case when  $K_n = K = \text{const}$  considered previously in [19].

Then,  $K_V = K = K_{\pm}$ , and the formula (15) reduces correctly to

$$\mu_{PM}^{\pm} = \left[ \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{1}{G_{\text{eff}}^v + \zeta_{\pm}} + \frac{2}{c_{44} + \zeta_{\pm}} + \frac{2}{c_{66} + \zeta_{\pm}} \right) \right]^{-1} - \zeta_{\pm}. \quad (16)$$

If we choose  $\zeta_{\pm} = 0$  or  $\infty$ , then (16) reduces to the formulas (23) and (22) for the correlated Reuss and Voigt bounds on the polycrystal's overall shear modulus. For this special case, the  $\zeta_- \rightarrow 0$  limit is correct because  $G_{\text{eff}}^v = G_{\text{eff}}^r$  when  $K_n = \text{const}$ .

Next, without placing any special restrictions on the layer constants, we can also check whether (15) reduces correctly to (22) as  $\zeta_+ \rightarrow \infty$  and (23) as  $\zeta_- \rightarrow 0$ . When  $\zeta_+ \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $K_+ \rightarrow K_V$ , so (15) reduces to (16) in this limit, and therefore performs as it should. As  $\zeta_- \rightarrow 0$ ,  $K \rightarrow K_R$ ,  $\alpha_- \rightarrow -1/K_R$ , and  $\beta_- \rightarrow \infty$ . The expected result (23) is then obtained because  $K_V/G_{\text{eff}}^v K_R = 1/G_{\text{eff}}^r$  follows from the product formula.

Uniaxial shear energy  $G_{\text{eff}}^v$  plays a dominant role in both formulas (15) and (16) — along with  $c_{44}$  and  $c_{66}$  — even though  $2G_{\text{eff}}^v$  is only rarely an eigenvalue of this system, while  $2c_{44}$  and  $2c_{66}$  are both always eigenvalues twice over.

#### IV. ELASTIC CONSTANT ESTIMATES FOR THE MODEL

We are now in position to create some useful effective medium approximations based on the formulas for the rigorous bounds (9) and (15) derived in the previous section. In each case the choices to be made seem quite apparent based both on the form of the bounds, and on prior experiences with other bounds and self-consistent estimates. The resulting formulas obtained this way will be called the “self-consistent” or *SC* estimate based on these correlated bounds.

We take the self-consistent estimate for bulk modulus to be

$$K^* = \frac{K_V(G_{\text{eff}}^r + \zeta^*)}{(G_{\text{eff}}^v + \zeta^*)} = \frac{(G_{\text{eff}}^v K_R + \zeta^* K_V)}{(G_{\text{eff}}^v + \zeta^*)}, \quad (17)$$

where

$$\zeta^* = \frac{\mu^*}{6} \left( \frac{9K^* + 8\mu^*}{K^* + 2\mu^*} \right). \quad (18)$$

In (18),  $K^*$  is determined by (17) and  $\mu^*$  is determined by the self-consistent expression for the shear modulus to follow. In fact,  $\mu^*$  is obtained similarly from (15) and we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu^* + \zeta^*} = \frac{1}{5} \left[ \frac{1 - \alpha^*(K_V - K^*)}{G_{\text{eff}}^v + \zeta^* + \frac{\alpha^*}{2\beta^*}(K_V - K^*)} + \frac{2}{c_{44} + \zeta^*} + \frac{2}{c_{66} + \zeta^*} \right]. \quad (19)$$

In all cases, these formulas are obtained by replacing the terms in the bounds everywhere so that  $K_{\pm} \rightarrow K^*$  and




FIG. 1: Comparison of the Peselnick-Meister shear modulus bounds and the self-consistent estimate over all choices of volume fraction, for the same case considered in Figures 2 and 3. Here the uniaxial shear energies  $G_{\text{eff}}^v$  (strain) and  $G_{\text{eff}}^r$  (stress) are both plotted as well to show that the condition  $G_{\text{eff}}^v \geq \mu_{SC}^*$ , which is the condition found sufficient to guarantee monotonicity of the self-consistent shear functional, is easily satisfied in all cases.

$G_{\pm} \rightarrow \mu^*$ . The result is a set of coupled equations that are most conveniently solved by numerical iteration.

This iteration process is expected to converge rapidly to definite unique answers for both  $K^*$  and  $\mu^*$ , and especially so if it can be shown that the individual formulas are monotonic functionals of their arguments. It is well-known that  $\zeta^*$  is a monotonic functional of both arguments [12]. It is also quite easy to check that  $K^*$  is a monotonic functional of  $\zeta^*$ . Since  $K^* \leq K_V$  will always be satisfied,  $\mu^*$  is easily shown to be a monotonic functional of  $\zeta^*$ . The only remaining issue to check is whether  $\mu^*$  is also a monotonic functional of  $K^*$ . A rather tedious analysis (which will therefore not be shown here) indicates that  $\mu^*$  is indeed a monotonic functional of  $K^*$  as long as  $\mu^* \leq G_{\text{eff}}^v$ . However, since  $G_{\text{eff}}^v$  is not the overall Voigt average of the shear modulus (but rather the energy per unit volume of the uniaxial shear component), it is not immediately clear that this inequality will necessarily be obeyed. We point out however that Figure 5 of [19] showed explicitly, for the special case of  $K_n = \text{const}$ , that  $\mu_{PM}^- \leq \mu_{SC}^* \leq \mu_{PM}^+ \leq G_{\text{eff}}^v$ . So it is quite possible that  $\mu_{SC}^* \leq G_{\text{eff}}^v$  is generally true. In any case, the iteration scheme itself tells us quickly enough whether the functional is behaving well or not; if not, then the convergence will either be slow or nonexistent, *i.e.*, jumping from one unstable point in the  $(\mu^*, K^*)$  space to another. Such unpleasant behavior has not been observed.

Figure 1 illustrates the behavior found in practice for the examples that follow. Both the bounds and the self-consistent estimates always lie below the two values  $G_{\text{eff}}^v$  and  $G_{\text{eff}}^r$ . Convergence is generally found in 2 or 3 iterations, as might be expected from the narrow range of values permitted by the bounds.




FIG. 2: Comparison of various bulk modulus bounds and estimates from the text. The stiff component has  $K = 50$  GPa and  $\mu = 40$  GPa, while the compliant component has  $K = 20$  GPa and  $\mu = 4$  GPa.




FIG. 3: Comparison of various shear modulus bounds and estimates from the text. Component elastic constants are the same as in Figure 2.

## V. EXAMPLES AND DISCUSSION

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the results obtained so far in the text. Three types of bounds (both upper and lower) are shown along with two effective medium estimates. The Hashin-Shtrikman bounds ( $HS^\pm$ ) for an isotropic composite composed of isotropic constituents, when no information about spatial correlation functions or other types of local ordering in the medium is known. These bounds are the outer most bounds shown here. (There are also uncorrelated Voigt and Reuss bounds available, but these fall outside of the all the ones presented here. In fact, the Voigt bound is just a straight line between the two end points in each case.)

The next best bounds are the Voigt and Reuss bounds based on knowledge of the crystalline nature of the aggre-

gate (VX and RX). Although these bounds are somewhat crude, they are nevertheless better/tighter bounds than the “uncorrelated” Hashin-Shtrikman bounds.

The best bounds are the Hashin-Shtrikman-type bounds of Peselnick, Meister, and Watts ( $PM^\pm$ ). These bounds take the local correlations of the crystalline (laminated) components into account, and are very accurate bounds in the sense that they are very close to each other for the present, fairly high contrast, example. Then, the self-consistent estimate SC (based as it is on the analytical form of the PM bounds) is seen to fall within these tightest bounds, as expected.

In contrast, the same type of self-consistent bound — for which we use the technical terms the CPA (for “coherent potential approximation”) and which is based instead on the original “uncorrelated” Hashin-Shtrikman bounds [by taking  $K_\pm \rightarrow K^*$  and  $\mu_\pm \rightarrow \mu^*$  in Eqs. (3) and (4)] — does not do a good job here. At least it is not accurately reflecting the true microstructure when the components are implicitly assumed to be spherical in shape (as is true in this way of constructing the CPA from  $HS^\pm$ ). In this illustration, for both the bulk and shear estimates, it starts out hugging the lower bound  $HS^-$  and then cuts across the diagram and ends up hugging the upper bound  $HS^+$ . It is clear that this behavior is wrong for this particular type of composite because the layering in the grains tends to emphasize the weaker component at high concentrations of the strong component, and the stronger component at low concentrations of the stronger component. This type of behavior could have been obtained from the CPA, but it would have required input of additional information about the microstructure (and also a different type of derivation — see [10]). We expect (and can easily confirm numerically) that the CPA will give quite similar results to those observed here if instead the components were assumed to be penny-shaped or disk-shaped objects, which would have been more consistent with the actual microstructure implicit in the “random polycrystal of laminates” model.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

Traditional effective medium theories have typically been formulated using physical arguments to arrive at thought experiments leading to definite predictions about the behavior of complex systems. A small subset of these formulations [13–15] has been shown to correspond to realizable (at least in principle) microstructures and, therefore, to the conclusion that these approximations should always satisfy any rigorous bounds known for the physical constants. But, such realizability conditions are *not* always easy to establish and *are always* subject to the criticism [29] that, even though the implicit microstructure is realizable, it is nevertheless not the pertinent microstructure for the system we need to study in the laboratory or in the field — being instead a typically hierarchical microstructure [13], requiring many levels for validity of

the required separation of scales.

But there are many bounds on physical constants available now [23]. So the question arises can we make use of these bounds in developing new effective medium estimates rather than in justifying them after the fact. The present work has shown that this is possible. To achieve this goal, it is most useful to have the bounds expressed as a pair of formulas, and preferably formulas that have the same functional form. The original Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds, for example, were expressed in terms of an algorithm – not as explicit formulas. Although it is obviously possible to arrive at estimates in either case (numerical curves can be averaged), it seems most useful to the author to have the formulas – for then formulas for the estimates are most easily and intuitively obtained. Whenever this is possible, the estimates presumably describe the physical behavior of the system for a typical microstructure from the ensemble of microstructures assumed in the original derivation of the bounds themselves.

Success here in simplifying the Peselnick-Meister bounds for random polycrystals having hexagonal symmetry also suggests that other bounds of this algorithmic type might also be simplified. Determining the answer to this question will one direction of work to follow. Another direction will involve additional complications that are introduced when the model layers are porous and the pores are saturated or partially saturated by fluids. Then, the model may serve as a semi-analytical model for the geomechanics of earth reservoirs.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank H. F. Wang for helpful discussions of these results and their potential applications. Work performed by University of California, Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract No. W-7405-ENG-48 and supported specifically by the Geosciences Research Program of the DOE Office of Basic Energy Sciences, Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences and Biosciences.

## APPENDIX A: VOIGT AND REUSS BOUNDS AND A PRODUCT FORMULA IN ELASTICITY

The bulk modulus for each such building block (or crystalline grain if you like) is that given by the compressional Reuss average  $K_R$  of the corresponding compliance matrix  $s_{ij}$  [the inverse of the usual stiffness matrix  $c_{ij}$ , whose nonzero components are shown in (1)]. The well-known result is  $e = e_{11} + e_{22} + e_{33} = \sigma/K_{\text{eff}}$ , where  $1/K_{\text{eff}} = 1/K_R = 2s_{11} + 2s_{12} + 4s_{13} + s_{33}$ . This quantity can be expressed in terms of the stiffness elements as

$$\frac{1}{K_R - c_{13}} = \frac{1}{c_{11} - c_{66} - c_{13}} + \frac{1}{c_{33} - c_{13}}. \quad (20)$$

The Voigt average for bulk modulus is well-known to be

$$K_V = [2(c_{11} + c_{12}) + 4c_{13} + c_{33}]/9. \quad (21)$$

Even though  $K_{\text{eff}}$  is the same for every grain, since the grains themselves are not isotropic, the overall bulk modulus  $K^*$  of the random polycrystal is not necessarily the same as the value  $K_{\text{eff}}$  for the individual grains [7]. Hashin-Shtrikman bounds on  $K^*$  for random polycrystals whose grains have hexagonal symmetry [20, 26] show in fact that the value  $K_R$  lies outside the bounds in many situations [19].

In general an upper bound on the overall shear modulus of an isotropic polycrystal [7] is given by the Voigt average over shear of the stiffness matrix, which may be written as

$$\mu_V = \frac{1}{5} (G_{\text{eff}}^v + 2c_{44} + 2c_{66}). \quad (22)$$

This expression can be taken as the definition of  $G_{\text{eff}}^v$ . Eq. (22) implies that  $G_{\text{eff}}^v = (c_{11} + c_{33} - 2c_{13} - c_{66})/3$ .  $G_{\text{eff}}^v$  is the energy per unit volume in a grain when a pure uniaxial shear strain of unit magnitude is applied to the grain along its axis of symmetry [28]. Then, the Reuss average for shear is

$$\mu_R = \left[ \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{1}{G_{\text{eff}}^r} + \frac{2}{c_{44}} + \frac{2}{c_{66}} \right) \right]^{-1}, \quad (23)$$

which is also a rigorous lower bound on the overall shear modulus of the polycrystal [7].

For each grain having hexagonal symmetry, the product formulas  $3K_R G_{\text{eff}}^v = 3K_V G_{\text{eff}}^r = \omega_+ \omega_- / 2 = c_{33}(c_{11} - c_{66}) - c_{13}^2$  are valid [28]. The symbols  $\omega_{\pm}$  stand for the quasi-compressional and quasi-uniaxial shear eigenvalues for all the grains. Whenever the bulk modulus in this model is uniform, the product formulas show immediately that  $G_{\text{eff}}^r = G_{\text{eff}}^v K_R / K_V = G_{\text{eff}}^v$ , since  $K_R = K_V = K$ . Thus, for this special case, pure compression or tension ( $e_{11} = e_{22} = e_{33}$ ) is an eigenvector corresponding to stiffness eigenvalue  $3K$ . Uniaxial shear strain ( $e_{33} = -2e_{11} = -2e_{22}$ ) is also an eigenvector and  $2G_{\text{eff}}^v = 2G_{\text{eff}}^r$  is the corresponding eigenvalue.

## APPENDIX B: PESELNICK-MEISTER-WATT BOUNDS FOR HEXAGONAL SYMMETRY

Hashin-Shtrikman-style bounds [9, 30] on the bulk and shear moduli of isotropic random polycrystals composed of hexagonal grains have been derived by Peselnick and Meister [20], with later corrections by Watt and Peselnick [26]. Derivations will be found in the references.

Parameters used to optimize the Hashin-Shtrikman bounds are  $K_{\pm}$  and  $G_{\pm}$ , which have the significance of being the bulk and shear moduli of two isotropic comparison materials.  $G_+$ ,  $K_+$  are the values used in the formulas for the upper bounds, and  $G_-$ ,  $K_-$  for the lower






FIG. 4: Illustrating the graphical construction leading to the optimum parameters for the comparison material of the lower and upper Peselnick-Meister-Watt bounds ( $G_-$ ,  $K_-$ ), ( $G_+$ ,  $K_+$ ), shown as circles, and the self-consistent estimate ( $\mu^*$ ,  $K^*$ ) obtained from the analytical form, shown as an asterisk. This case shown is for the volume fraction of the stiffer component from Figures 2 and 3 given by  $f_1 = 0.4$ . Values of the constants entering the expressions (see Appendix A) are:  $K_V = 29.0055$ ,  $c_{44} = 6.2500$ ,  $c_{66} = 18.4000$ ,  $G_{\text{eff}}^r = 12.0571$ , and  $G_{\text{eff}}^v = 12.6506$ , all in units of GPa. The two parts of the solid curve are determined by (40).

bounds. Formulas for the bounds are:

$$K_{PM}^\pm = K_\pm + \frac{K_V - K_\pm}{1 + 2\beta_\pm(G_\pm - G_{\text{eff}}^v)}, \quad (24)$$

and

$$\mu_{PM}^\pm = G_\pm + \frac{B_2^\pm}{1 + 2\beta_\pm B_2^\pm}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\pm &= \frac{-1}{K_\pm + 4G_\pm/3}, \\ \beta_\pm &= \frac{2\alpha_\pm}{15} - \frac{1}{5G_\pm}, \\ \gamma_\pm &= \frac{1}{9}(\alpha_\pm - 3\beta_\pm), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

and

$$B_2^\pm = \frac{1}{5} \left[ \frac{G_{\text{eff}}^v - G_\pm}{\mathcal{D}_\pm} + \frac{2(c_{44} - G_\pm)}{1 - 2\beta_\pm(c_{44} - G_\pm)} + \frac{2(c_{66} - G_\pm)}{1 - 2\beta_\pm(c_{66} - G_\pm)} \right], \quad (27)$$

with

$$\mathcal{D}_\pm = 1 - \beta_\pm(c_{11} + c_{12} + c_{33} - 3K_\pm - 2G_\pm) - 9\gamma_\pm(K_V - K_\pm). \quad (28)$$

Optimum values of the moduli for the comparison materials have been shown to be (in our notation)

$$K_\pm = \frac{K_V(G_{\text{eff}}^r - G_\pm)}{(G_{\text{eff}}^v - G_\pm)}, \quad (29)$$

where, for  $K_-$ ,

$$0 \leq G_- \leq \min(c_{44}, G_{\text{eff}}^r, c_{66}), \quad (30)$$




FIG. 5: Same as Figure 4 for the volume fraction of the stiffer component from Figures 2 and 3 given by  $f_1 = 0.6$ . Values of the constants entering the expressions are:  $K_V = 34.1792$ ,  $c_{44} = 8.6957$ ,  $c_{66} = 25.6000$ ,  $G_{\text{eff}}^r = 17.4441$ , and  $G_{\text{eff}}^v = 18.2641$ , all in units of GPa.

and where, for  $K_+$ ,

$$\max(c_{44}, G_{\text{eff}}^v, c_{66}) \leq G_+ \leq \infty. \quad (31)$$

Note that, when  $G_- = 0$ ,  $K_- = K_R$ , because  $K_R = K_V G_{\text{eff}}^r / G_{\text{eff}}^v$  from the product formulas [28]. When  $G_+ \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $K_+ \rightarrow K_V$ .

For the laminated materials considered here, the minimum condition in (30) will never be satisfied by  $c_{66}$  except in the trivial case of constant shear modulus. Each of the other two arguments can possibly become the minimum under certain nontrivial circumstances. For the materials considered here, the maximum condition in (31) will always be uniquely satisfied by  $c_{66}$ , except again for the trivial case of constant shear modulus.

Peselnick and Meister [20] had originally obtained all these results except for the additional condition in (30) that permits  $c_{44}$  to be replaced in some circumstances by  $G_{\text{eff}}^r$ . This new condition was added later by Watt and Peselnick [26].

The structure of the algorithm for computing these bounds is illustrated in Figures 4 and 5.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. C. Maxwell, *Treatise on Electricity and Magnetism* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, 1873).
- [2] L. Rayleigh, *Phil. Mag.* **34**, 481 (1892).
- [3] A. Einstein, *Ann. Phys.* **19**, 289 (1905).
- [4] W. Voigt, *Lehrbuch der Kristallphysik* (Teubner, Leipzig, 1928).
- [5] A. Reuss, *Z. Angew. Math. Mech.* **9**, 49 (1929).
- [6] D. A. G. Bruggeman, *Ann. Physik. (Leipzig)* **24**, 636 (1935).
- [7] R. Hill, *Proc. Phys. Soc. London A* **65**, 349 (1952).

- [8] Z. Hashin and S. Shtrikman, J. Franklin Inst. **271**, 336 (1961).
- [9] Z. Hashin and S. Shtrikman, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **10**, 335 (1962).
- [10] J. G. Berryman, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **68**, 1809 (1980).
- [11] J. G. Berryman, J. Acoust. Soc. Am. **68**, 1820 (1980).
- [12] J. G. Berryman, in *Elastic Wave Scattering and Propagation*, edited by V. K. Varadan and V. V. Varadan (Ann Arbor Science, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1982), pp. 111–129.
- [13] G. W. Milton, Comm. Math. Phys. **99**, 463 (1985).
- [14] A. N. Norris, Mech. Mater. **4**, 1 (1985).
- [15] M. Avellaneda, Commun. Pure Appl. Math **40**, 527 (1987).
- [16] L. V. Gibiansky and G. W. Milton, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **440**, 163 (1993).
- [17] G. W. Milton and J. G. Berryman, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **453**, 1849 (1997).
- [18] L. V. Gibiansky, G. W. Milton, and J. G. Berryman, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **455**, 2117 (1999).
- [19] J. G. Berryman, J. Appl. Phys. **XX**, xxx (2004).
- [20] L. Peselnick and R. Meister, J. Appl. Phys **36**, 2879 (1965).
- [21] G. E. Backus, J. Geophys. Res. **67**, 4427 (1962).
- [22] G. W. Postma, Geophysics **20**, 780 (1955).
- [23] G. W. Milton, *The Theory of Composites* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002).
- [24] J. G. Berryman, Trans. ASME J. Energy Resources Tech. **116**, 87 (1994).
- [25] G. W. Milton, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46**, 542 (1981).
- [26] J. P. Watt and L. Peselnick, J. Appl. Phys. **51**, 1525 (1980).
- [27] L. J. Walpole, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **14**, 151 (1966).
- [28] J. G. Berryman, Geophys. J. Int. **127**, 415 (2004).
- [29] R. M. Christensen, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **38**, 379 (1990).
- [30] Z. Hashin and S. Shtrikman, J. Mech. Phys. Solids **11**, 127 (1963).